DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 925 CE 024 600

AUTHOR McCauley, Lynne D.: Rusling, Diane E.

TITLE Final Report for the Intensified Career Exploration Program.

INSTITUTION Policy Studies in Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Behavior: Career Development: Career Education: *Career Exploration: Cognitive Ability: *Cognitive Development: Grade 9: Grade 10: High Schools: *Program Effectiveness: Program Evaluation: *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Ohio: Ohio Career Development Program

ABSTRACT

An intensified Career Exploration Program was evaluated through an analysis of the cognitive and affective learning resulting from ninth- and tenth-grade students' participation in the program. Designed to supplement the existing ninth- and tenth-grade components of the Ohio Career Development Program, this three-year program offered additional instruction and activities and provided opportunities for explorations into the community to 10% of tenth-grade students in six school districts: Akron, Boardman Local, Dayton City, Kirtland Local, Lorain City, and Minford Local. Design of the analysis of student learning involved administration of Revised Final Test--Grade 10 to students participating in both programs as well as non-program students at the end of the 1976-77 school year, pre-post administration of the same test to students participating in the programs in 1977-78, and post-administration of the test to only students in the intensified program in 1978-79. The seven developmental areas tested were self, employability and work adjustment, world of work, decision making, education and training, individual and environment, and economics. Findings indicated that students in the intensified program displayed more career-related learning in each developmental area, particularly regarding cognitive (as apposed to affective) learning. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183925

FINAL REPORT FOR THE INTENSIFIED CAREER EXPLORATION PROGRAM

A Comparison of Student Learning in the First, Second, and Third Years of VEA Part D Funding

Prepared by

Lynne D. Macaulay
Diane E. Rusling

POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION
680 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10019
(212) 397-0040

A Division of the
Academy for Educational Development

1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 024 600

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
PROCEDURES	3
Design	3
Testing Instrument	4
Testing Sample	4
Test Administration	5
Data Analysis	5
FINDINGS	7
Data Received	7
Analysis by Developmental Area	9
Analysis by Cognitive Item Score	12
Analysis by Affective Item Score	15
SUMMARY	18
APPENDIX	

INTRODUCTION

The intensified Career Exploration program (CE_1) was a part of the Ohio Career Development Program. During the 1978-79 school year, this program was in its third and final year of funding from Federal VEA Part D funds. The intensified program operated in six local districts for the full three years. These six districts also carried out regular Career Exploration programs (CE_2) and were as follows:

Akron City School District
Boardman Local School District
Dayton City School District
Kirtland Local School District
Lorain City School District
Minford Local School District

This report discusses the cognitive and affective learning which resulted from ninth and tenth grade students' involvement in the program. Because students were tested during the first, second, and third years, this report compares and evaluates the CE_1 program's strengths and weaknesses across its three years in operation.

In addition to this analysis of student learning, Policy Studies in Education as third party evaluator of the program also made site visits to each of the local districts three times during the CE_1 program's funded period. These site visits were reported separately and focused on the activities and management of the local programs.[1]

---

[1]The site visit reports were as follows:
1976-77 Site Visit Report, Six Demonstration Programs for Career Exploration Through EBCE, June, 1977.
1977-78 Site Visit Report for the Intensified Career Exploration Programs in Six Ohio Career Development Programs, June, 1978.
1978-79 Site Visit Report for the Experienced Based Career Education Programs, April, 1979.

BACKGROUND

The intensified program (CE_1) was designed to supplement the existing ninth and the tenth grade component of the Ohio Career Development Program (CE_2). It shared the same objectives and goals of this component. These goals and objectives encompassed a broad spectrum of career-related concepts and attitudes and were subgrouped into the following seven developmental areas: Self, Decision Making, Economics, Education and Training, Employability and Work Adjustment Skills, Individual and Environment, and World of Work. The Career Exploration (CE_2) component was offered to all ninth and tenth grade students through their curriculum courses. The classroom teachers taught career development concepts by infusing these concepts into their regular lessons throughout the school year. Students in the regular component were also encouraged to make explorations into the community.

The intensified program (CE_1) identified a group of students (typically 10% of the tenth grade students), offered additional instruction and activities, and provided opportunities for these students to make explorations into the community. All of the CE_1 students also benefited from the regular Career Exploration (CE_2) component through their curriculum courses. The number of activities offered through the CE_1 program and the length of program involvement varied by local school district and ranged from a few activities over a few weeks to a one- or two-period course over the full school year.

PROCEDURES

Design

The design of this analysis of student learning was selected to complement the analyses done for the first and second years of the CE_1 program. The first year's analysis compared the results of a test designed to measure cognitive and affective learning related to career development. Students participating in the CE_1 program and a sample of students in the CE_2 program, in addition to non-program students, were tested at the end of the 1976-77 school year. The second year's evaluation required a pretest and posttest administration of the same student test to CE_1 students and a sample of CE_2 students. Non-program students were not tested. In order to have comparable data for the three years of the CE_1 program, the research design for this final year included a posttest administration of the same student test for students participating in the CE_1 program.

The remaining sections under procedures in this report deal with the 1979 testing. The procedures for 1978 and 1977 are described in their respective reports.[2]

---

[2] Ohio Experience Based Career Education Program, Analysis of Student Learning, August, 1977.

Analysis of Student Learning in the Intensified Career Exploration Program, August, 1978.

Testing Instrument

The same student test, the Revised Final Test--Grade 10, was used for this analysis.[3] It consisted of 81 multiple choice or agree/disagree items distributed across the seven developmental areas as follows:

Table 1

Distribution of Test Items

Developmental Area	Multiple Choice Items	Agree/ Disagree Items	Total Per Area
Self	6	7	13
Employability and Work Adjustment	7	4	11
World of Work	8	3	11
Decision Making	6	8	14
Education and Training	7	8	15
Individual and Environment	2	6	8
Economics	7	2	9
TOTAL	43	38	81

Testing Sample

All students in each of the local school districts who participated in the CE_1 program were included in the testing sample. Depending on the school district, some of these

[3]See Ohio Experience Based Career Education Program, Analysis of Student Learning, August 1977, page 3 for more specific information about the student test.

students were ninth grade students. However, the majority were tenth grade students.

Test Administration

Program directors in the local districts administered the test to students at the end of the school year. Actual administration dates in the local districts varied from May 16 through June 7, 1979.

Data Analysis

Local program directors were responsible for returning the completed student tests to the Career Development Service, which was responsible for scoring the student tests as well as carrying out the initial analysis of the data. The Career Development Service initial analysis presented the percentage of students answering an item correctly for each local district's CE_1 group and for the state CE_1 group.[4] However, local districts' results were not reported in this report.

In addition to the item data, average scores were computed for the cognitive and affective items[5] and items subgrouped in each of the seven developmental areas.[6]

The 1979 scores for the state CE_1 group were compared to the cognitive and affective scores and the developmental area scores for the CE_1 and CE_2 groups in 1978 and 1977.

---

[4]The state results are the combined results for all students across the six local districts.

[5]The cognitive and affective scores are the percentage of students answering correctly an average cognitive or affective item in a developmental area.

[6]The developmental area scores are the percentage of students answering correctly an average item in a developmental area subgroup.

The focus of the data analysis reported here was to answer the following questions:

Across the three years the CE_1 program operated, did the CE_1 students learn more than the CE_2 students in:

1) each developmental area?
2) knowledge of career-related concepts (cognitive learning)?
3) attitudes reflecting career concepts (affective learning)?

FINDINGS

Data Received

1978-79 Completed student tests were received for a total of 344 students in the CE_1 program. The following table shows the number of students from each district.

Table 2

Number of CE_1 Students Completing Student Tests by District

District Name	Number of CE_1 Students
Akron	171
Boardman	106
Dayton	16
Kirtland	10
Lorain	27
Minford	14
Total State	344

1976-78 For comparitive purposes, the numbers of CE_1 and CE_2 students in the 1977 and 1978 analyses of student learning were as follows:

1977 Analysis		1978 Analysis	
CE_1 Students	CE_2 Students	CE_1 Students	CE_2 Students
248	224	246	503

Thus, student test results for CE_1 students were available for all three years--1977, 1978, and 1979--and CE_2 results were available for two years--1977 and 1978.[7]

[7]In 1977, a group of non-program students was tested. The 1978 analysis, however, questioned the comparability between this non-program group and either of the two program groups. It appeared that the non-program group either contained "better" students or that the non-program students had actually been exposed to career development concepts. (See Analysis of Student Learning in the Intensified Career Exploration Program, August, 1978.) For these reasons, the 1977 non-program results are not presented in this analysis.

Analysis by Developmental Area

Did the CE_1 students learn more than the CE_2 students in each developmental area?

Year-by-Year Analysis

During each year that the intensified program (CE_1) operated, the developmental area scores of the CE_1 students were higher than the scores of the CE_2 students (see Table 3). The greatest difference between the CE_1 and CE_2 scores occurred during the first year (1977) that the program existed, when there was a difference of at least 10 percentage points between the CE_1 and CE_2 scores in each developmental area, with the exception of World of Work (see Table 4). During that initial year, the first semester was devoted to program planning and the second to involving students in the program. Most of the local program directors were able to concentrate on the setting up and running of the CE_1 program without having major responsibilities to other career development components. The intensified program was new, and the enthusiasm of the local directors and students was very high.

Although the results during the second year showed gains between pretest and posttest time, they did not indicate as great a difference between the CE_1 and CE_2 groups. Typically, there was a difference of between 3 and 6 percentage points in the scores for the two groups that year.

The 1979 scores for the CE_1 program were somewhat better. (The 1979 results were compared to the 1977 CE_2 results which

Table 3

Developmental Area Scores for Three Years

CE_1 and CE_2 Results

	CE_1 Results			CE_2 Results	
	1979	1978	1977	1978	1977
Self	55%	51%	63%	45%	47%
Employability and Work Adjustment	52	45	57	42	44
World of Work	48	48	49	42	44
Decision Making	50	49	59	43	44
Education and Training	46	45	58	41	44
Individual and Environment	42	38	44	34	33
Economics	63	60	66	55	56

Table 4

Difference in Developmental Area Scores
(in Percentage Points)

	CE_1 - CE_2 Results		
	1979	1978	1977
Self	8	6	16
Employability and Work Adjustment	8	3	13
World of Work	4	6	5
Decision Making	6	6	14
Education and Training	2	4	14
Individual and Environment	9	4	11
Economics	7	5	10

were the higher of the two CE_2 groups and thus offered the most competition.) There was a difference of 8 to 9 percentage points between the scores for the CE_1 and CE_2 groups in Self, Employability and Work Adjustment, and Individual and Environment, and there was almost as much difference in the scores in Economics and Decision Making.

Across the Three Years

Across the three years, the developmental area scores that showed the greatest difference between the CE_1 and CE_2 students were in the area of Self (see Table 4). One explanation for this difference was that the intensified program provided students with individualized attention and focused on the students' understanding of their strengths and weaknesses, likes and dislikes, and interests and abilities as they related to their school work and career choices. (See Site Visit Report, April, 1979, for students' quotes on how the program helped them in this respect.)

During the first and second years, the CE_1 program was also successful in the area of Decision Making, which stood out among the other developmental areas as one in which the difference between the CE_1 and CE_2 scores was large. At least during these two years, the program had been able to give students information and experiences in the area of Decision Making which is more than what students typically receive in their regular classrooms.

Analysis by Cognitive Item Score

Did the CE_1 students learn more than the CE_2 students in knowledge of career-related concepts?

Year-by-Year Analysis

This section deals with the cognitive learning within each developmental area. Across the three years, the CE_1 students' cognitive scores were higher than the CE_2 students scores in each developmental area (see Table 5). During the first year of the program, the CE_1 students scored considerably higher than the CE_2 students in three areas: Self, Education and Training, and Individual and the Environment (see Table 6). In all three of these areas, the CE_1 score was at least 10 percentage points higher than the CE_2 score.

The results from the second year's testing showed a difference of 10 percentage points for the CE_1 and CE_2 scores in Decision Making. In the remaining six areas, the difference between CE_1 and CE_2 scores was fewer than 10.

The results from the 1979 testing indicated that this year's program was the strongest in teaching cognitive concepts. There was a difference of at least 10 percentage points between the CE_1 and CE_2 results[8] in five of the seven areas: Economics, Self, Employability and Work Adjustment, Decision Making, and Education and Training.

[8]The CE_2 results from 1977 were used in this comparison to be consistent with the data reported previously.

Table 5

Cognitive Scores Across Three Years

	CE_1 Results			CE_2 Results	
	1979	1978	1977	1978	1977
Self	80%	75%	78%	68%	67%
Employability and Work Adjustment	64	56	61	53	54
World of Work	59	54	54	51	52
Decision Making	82	82	76	72	72
Education and Training	76	72	75	68	65
Individual and Environment	64	62	70	60	56
Economics	74	70	73	63	64

Table 6

Difference in Cognitive Scores Across Three Years
(in Percentage Points)

	CE_1 - CE_2 Results		
	1979	1978	1977
Self	13	7	11
Employability and Work Adjustment	10	3	7
World of Work	7	3	2
Decision Making	10	10	4
Education and Training	11	4	10
Individual and Environment	8	2	14
Economics	10	7	9

Each year's program appeared to offer students different information and experiences and resulted in students showing superior knowledge in different areas. During at least one year, the CE_1 students scored considerably higher than the CE_2 students on the cognitive items in six of the seven developmental areas.

Across the Three Years

Across the three years, the cognitive scores indicated that the CE_1 program was strongest in teaching concepts related to the area of Self (see Table 6). In each year, the cognitive scores for the CE_1 students for Self were among the areas in which the CE_1 students outscored the CE_2 students.

During the second and third years, the CE_1 students' cognitive scores also suggested that the CE_1 program was strong in teaching cognitive concepts related to Economics and Decision Making. The cognitive results for Education and Training suggested that the CE_1 program during the first and third years was also strong in this area.

Analysis by Affective Items Score

Did the CE_1 students, more so than the CE_2 students, have attitudes reflecting an appreciation for career-related concepts?

Year-by-Year Analysis

This section deals with the affective learning within each developmental area. Compared to the same groups used in the cognitive score analysis, the first and second years' CE_1 scores were higher than the CE_2 scores in each developmental area (see Table 7). The affective scores for the 1979 CE_1 group varied by developmental area.

The 1977 affective scores in each developmental area were higher than those in the other two years for both the CE_1 and CE_2 groups. The 1977 CE_1 scores were at least 13 percentage points higher than the CE_2 scores in six of the seven developmental areas (see Table 8). The difference between the CE_1 and CE_2 students' scores was lowest for the area of World of Work, (8). The affective test score for this first year probably reflected rather accurately the enthusiasm and interest the students had in the program that first year.

During the second year, the difference in the affective scores for CE_1 and CE_2 students was not as great. The greatest difference in the scores occurred in the area of World of Work, where the CE_1 score was 14 percentage points higher

Table 7

Affective Scores Across Three Years

	CE_1 Results			CE_2 Results	
	1979	1978	1977	1978	1977
Self	34%	28%	47%	25%	29%
Employability and Work Adjustment	30	27	51	22	29
World of Work	21	32	27	18	19
Decision Making	27	24	50	21	30
Education and Training	20	21	42	18	23
Individual and Environment	35	30	39	25	26
Economics	23	25	48	21	30

Table 8

Difference in Affective Scores Across Three Years (in Percentage Points)

	CE_1 - CE_2 Results		
	1979	1978	1977
Self	5	3	18
Employability and Work Adjustment	1	5	32
World of Work	2	14	8
Decision Making	-3	3	20
Education and Training	-3	3	19
Individual and Environment	9	5	13
Economics	-7	4	18

than the CE_2 score. In the remaining six areas, the difference between the two groups' scores was five or fewer percentage points. This second year was not nearly as successful in changing attitudes as the first year had been.

The scores for the third year did not indicate program strengths in affective learning. The CE_1 scores for 1979 were 5 and 9 percentage points higher than the CE_2 scores in two developmental areas: Self and Individual and Environment, respectively.

Overall across the three years, the CE_1 program was successful in encouraging positive attitudes in its students in each of the developmental areas at least during one of the three years it operated. The first year was by far the most successful year in changing the attitudes of students in six of the seven developmental areas.

Across the Three Years

Across the three years, the strength of the CE_1 program in affective learning showed up in the area of Individual and Environment (see Table 8). In each year, the CE_1 students' score compared to the CE_2 score for this area stood out among their other scores. The program was also successful during the first and third years in causing affective learning related to Self and, in the first and second years, in affective learning related to Employability and Work Adjustment.

SUMMARY

Overall, each year that the CE_1 program operated, the students involved in it displayed more career-related learning in each developmental area than the students in the regular CE_2 component. Across the three years, this learning was more cognitive than affective. The CE_1 results suggested how an intensified experience characterized by the individualized attention given to students who were interested in exploring particular careers could influence their knowledge of and attitudes toward rather general career-related concepts as measured by a particular student test.

The first year of the CE_1 program was the most successful of the three years in causing learning in each developmental area, both cognitive and affective. It is quite possible that during the first year the experiences and attention given to students were also the most intensified.

In the second year, the program operated for a full year and, in many cases, with reduced staffing. Some of the students who were tested in the evaluation were students who participated in the program early in the school year and were tested at the end of the year. It is quite possible that their results (particularly the affective results) would have been different if they had been tested immediately after their experience with the program, as was the case with the first-year students.

By the third year, most of the local school districts had established a program which they felt comfortable with and one which met the needs of their communities and students. The third year results, especially compared to the second year results, suggested that the final year of the CE_1 program provided students with experiences and information which they would not have received in the regular classroom.

APPENDIX

State Item Results for

1977, 78, and 79

State Totals

Final Test - Grade 10

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA AND ITEM NUMBER	1979 CE_1	1978 CE_1	1977 CE_1	1978 CE_2	1977 CE_2
Self					
20	86%	80%	81%	69%	77%
24	80	78	79	72	62
33	67	65	71	56	57
38	90	90	93	81	78
41	90	86	84	74	75
43	66	61	62	55	52
46	34	31	55	26	40
47	26	21	42	20	29
58	60	52	73	43	51
71	24	22	42	24	32
78	29	26	30	17	18
79	28	18	26	19	14
80	36	27	33	26	22
AVERAGE	55	51	59	45	47
Employability and Work Adjustment					
3	74%	69%	72%	67%	63%
16	78	68	69	64	66
17	83	74	81	71	76
18	68	55	65	48	48
26	63	60	63	57	55
40	23	13	22	16	21
42	56	50	52	45	43
52	24	30	25	22	13
61	36	33	57	25	33
75	36	25	55	20	36
76	26	21	52	22	34
AVERAGE	52	45	57	42	44

State Totals

Final Test - Grade 10

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA AND ITEM NUMBER	1979 CE_1	1978 CE_1	1977 CE_1	1978 CE_2	1977 CE_2
World of Work					
1	66%	62%	53%	46%	57%
5	56	44	45	46	46
9	69	51	57	56	52
27	54	58	57	51	48
28	56	54	60	54	54
29	45	48	45	44	42
30	67	61	62	58	59
32	56	50	52	54	54
49	17	20	36	14	24
68	16	50	12	13	11
81	31	27	21	27	22
AVERAGE	*48*	*48*	*49*	*42*	*44*
Decision Making					
6	68%	76%	48%	56%	56%
10	91	93	94	84	84
11	83	80	78	71	68
12	93	89	90	85	87
34	90	86	85	75	79
37	68	65	57	61	61
55	28	30	46	19	28
57	28	27	49	25	31
63	34	25	58	21	37
66	20	14	47	13	28
70	14	17	39	14	18
73	40	37	58	33	38

State Totals

Final Test - Grade 10

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA AND ITEM NUMBER	1979 CE_1	1978 CE_1	1977 CE_1	1978 CE_2	1977 CE_2
Decision Making (continued)					
74	25%	21%	54%	22%	34%
77	24	21	52	18	28
AVERAGE	*50*	*49*	*59*	*43*	*44*
Education and Training					
4	80%	77%	82%	78%	68%
8	62	60	64	59	53
13	80	79	77	66	65
22	89	85	82	76	78
23	75	62	67	62	61
25	83	80	78	72	72
31	63	63	74	62	59
44	10	18	55	16	33
45	20	23	45	17	22
50	22	21	12	17	12
62	28	28	52	24	36
64	23	15	48	19	29
65	21	21	43	20	28
67	13	8	9	13	8
69	19	32	29	19	19
AVERAGE	*46*	*45*	*58*	*41*	*44*

State Totals

Final Test - Grade 10

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA AND ITEM NUMBER	1979 CE_1	1978 CE_1	1977 CE_1	1978 CE_2	1977 CE_2
Individual and Environment					
7	71%	70%	79%	62%	60%
15	58	53	60	57	51
48	38	33	27	27	25
51	32	22	12	22	12
54	29	31	30	20	21
56	49	48	71	34	47
59	34	25	38	27	25
60	26	19	45	19	29
AVERAGE	*42*	*38*	*44*	*34*	*33*
Economics					
2	76%	68%	83%	63%	64%
14	74	77	81	74	70
19	72	65	59	57	61
21	82	86	80	71	75
35	87	86	84	77	77
36	61	48	64	52	49
39	66	60	65	59	56
53	15	20	40	17	25
72	31	30	56	26	34
AVERAGE	*63*	*60*	*66*	*55*	*56*

MINFORD

% Showing Average Score in Each Area

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA	1978 Minford CE_1	1979 Minford CE_1	1979 State CE_1	Difference Between 1979 State and Minford Scores
Self	60%	35%	55%	-20
Employability and Work Adjustment	55	44	52	-8
World of Work	54	40	48	-8
Decision Making	53	37	50	-13
Education and Training	59	41	46	-5
Individual and Environment	44	38	42	-4
Economics	83	57	63	-6

LORAIN

% Showing Average Score in Each Area

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA	1978 Lorain CE_1	1979 Lorain CE_1	1979 State CE_1	Difference Between 1979 State and Lorain Scores
Self	52%	47%	55%	-8
Employability and Work Adjustment	47	47	52	-5
World of Work	44	41	48	-7
Decision Making	47	46	50	-4
Education and Training	45	41	46	-5
Individual and Environment	34	37	42	-5
Economics	61	63	63	-

KIRTLAND

% Showing Average Score in Each Area

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA	1978 Kirkland CE_1	1979 Kirkland CE_1	1979 State CE_1	Difference Between 1979 State and Kirkland Scores
Self	55%	54%	55%	-1
Employability and Work Adjustment	52	46	52	-6
World of Work	49	46	48	-2
Decision Making	53	50	50	-
Education and Training	53	47	46	+1
Individual and Environment	45	40	42	-2
Economics	73	70	63	+7

DAYTON

% Showing Average Score in Each Area

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA	1978 Dayton CE_1	1979 Dayton CE_1	1979 State CE_1	Difference Between 1979 State and Dayton Scores
Self	51%	52%	55%	-3
Employability and Work Adjustment	47	55	52	+3
World of Work	48	52	48	+4
Decision Making	52	54	50	+4
Education and Training	47	61	46	+15
Individual and Environment	43	55	42	+13
Economics	62	62	63	-1

BOARDMAN

% Showing Average Score in Each Area

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA	1978 Boardman CE_1	1979 Boardman CE_1	1979 State CE_1	Difference Between 1979 State and Boardman Scores
Self	53%	51%	55%	-4
Employability and Work Adjustment	45	53	52	+1
World of Work	51	50	48	+2
Decision Making	46	48	50	-2
Education and Training	53	45	46	-1
Individual and Environment	50	39	42	-3
Economics	68	63	63	-

AKRON

% Showing Average Score in Each Area

DEVELOPMENTAL AREA	1978 Akron CE_1	1979 Akron CE_1	1979 State CE_1	Difference Between 1979 State and Akron Scores
Self	46%	60%	55%	+5
Employability and Work Adjustment	40	52	52	-
World of Work	41	49	48	+1
Decision Making	43	53	50	+3
Education and Training	37	46	46	-
Individual and Environment	32	44	42	+2
Economics	49	62	63	-1